```
BEFORE THE
 1
                           SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD
                              STATE OF WASHINGTON
 2
    IN THE MATTER OF A SUBSTANTIAL
 3
    DEVELOPMENT ISSUED TO THE
    WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT
 4
    OF TRANSPORTATION
 5
    VESTEL O. MANASCO,
 6
                          Appellant,
                                                   SHB No.
                                                             78-31
 7
                                                   ORDER DISMISSING
                 v.
                                                   REQUEST FOR REVIEW
 ರ
    CITY OF KELSO; WASHINGTON
    STATE DEPARTMENT OF
9
    TRANSPORTATION,
10
                        Respondents,
11
    WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT
    OF ECOLOGY,
12
                     Amicus Curiae.
13
```

This matter came before the Shorelines Hearings Board on motion of the respondent Department of Transportation to dismiss a request for review of appellant Vestel Manasco on the grounds that the Board has no jurisdiction over the matter. Respondent City of Kelso joined in the motion. The matter was presented to the Board through written documents

14

15

16

17

18

and written arguments submitted by the parties. Appellant appeared prose; respondent Department of Transportation appeared through Charles F. Secrest, Assistant Attorney General; respondent City of Kelso appeared through its attorney, C. LeRoy Borders. The Department of Ecology and Attorney General provided a statement of their position through their attorney, Robert V. Jensen.

The Shorelines Hearings Board has jurisdiction to hear appeals arising under RCW 90.58.180, WAC 173-14-170, and WAC 173-14-064. This is not an appeal pursuant to an enforcement action by local government or the Department of Ecology as provided in WAC 173-14-180 and 173-14-190. Persons aggrieved by the granting, denying or rescinding of a permit may The appeal must be certified by the Attorney General appeal to the Board. or the Department of Ecology within 30 days after their receipt of the request for review. The Board cannot review any matter which has not been certified. Under the appeal route available to the appellant, RCW 90.58.180(1), his appeal must be certified by the Attorney General or the Department of Ecology. The record shows that the Attorney General and Department of Ecology did not certify the appeal within the time allowed, and in accordance with RCW 90.58.180(1) "the hearing board shall remove the request from its review schedule." Although the statute clearly prohibits the review of a matter which is not certified, appellant is not precluded from obtaining review in superior court under any right otherwise available. RCW 90.58.180(1). We further note that pursuant to RCW 90.58.140(5)(c), the court could remand such appeal to this Board.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

<sup>1.</sup> WAC 173-14-170 and 064 provide that appeals are governed by RCW 90.58.180.

1	Accordingly, the motion to dismiss is granted and the request for
2	review is dismissed.
3	DATED this 17th day of November, 1978.
4	SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD
5	has the office
6	DAVE J. MOONEY, Chairman
7	( South
8	CHRIS SMITH, Member
9	Dairl alean
10	DAVID AKANA, Member
11	Holet Etail
12	ROBERT E. BEATY, Member
3	MILITAM A TOUNGOU Marker
14	WILLIAM A. JOHNSON, Member
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	